

### Remarks

In response to the Office Action of December 28, 2005, the Applicant asks the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 5 in view of the arguments presented herein:

Claims 1-5 are pending at the time of the Office Action. Claims 1-4 are indicated as being allowed. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,888,837 to Cunningham et al. (hereinafter Cunningham).

### Allowed Claims

The Applicant would like to acknowledge, with appreciation, the allowance of claims 1-4.

### Rejection of Claims

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Cunningham.

The Applicant submits that Cunningham does not describe or suggest a name and address server according to claim 5. The server of claim 5 is situated in the first addressing zone of a digital telecommunications network having first and second addressing zones between which an interface caters for address translations. This server includes a data storage for storing associations between machine names and addresses of the first zone. The server further includes a data processing module designed to respond to the receipt from a first address of the first zone, of a request for an address related to the name of a destination machine belonging to the second addressing zone through the transmission to a second address of the first zone of a first packet containing at least the name of destination machine. The processing module is also designed to send back to the first address a response, after receipt from the second zone of a second packet containing a third address of the first zone associated in a dynamic manner with a second address of the second zone, providing the third address of the first zone.

The Examiner notes that Cunningham "teaches about a name and an address server in a digital telecommunication network having first and second addressing zones between which an interface caters for address translations."

Furthermore, the Examiner is of the opinion that, in Cunningham, the server includes:

- a data storage module for storing associations between machine names and addresses of the first zone; and
- a data processing module designed to respond to the receipt, originating from a first address of the first zone, of a request for provision of an address in relation with the name of a destination machine belonging to the second addressing zone.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The passage cited by the Examiner (column 7, lines 20-30) describes only the general behavior of the DNS which caters for address translation in a conventional way.

Cunningham describes a translation table which is stored in the NAT 102 and not in the DNS. Thus, Cunningham's translation table, which the Examiner likens to the Applicant's "module for storing associations between names and addresses," is not in a server of the first zone (column 7, lines 59 - column 8, line 26).

The translation table of Cunningham allows translation of addresses between two different zones referred to as "the source" and "the destination". From the passage cited by the Examiner, it appears that every address from the source zone is translated into an address of the destination zone and vice versa. Thus, the association performed in Cunningham is not an association between machine names and addresses of the first zone as Applicant's claim 5 recites.

Furthermore, in Cunningham, only two different addresses from the first zone are used as the response message 410 includes the destination host global address which is an address of the destination zone (column 9, lines 1-4) and not of the source zone.

Finally, contrary to the Applicant's server that uses a dynamic association of addresses, in Cunningham, the addresses are translated according to a static table stored in the NAT 102.

Accordingly, Cunningham does not describe or suggest a server of a first zone able to perform a dynamic association between a second address of the second zone and a third address of the first zone.

Therefore, Cunningham does not anticipate claim 5.

In re Application of: Francois-Arnaud Remael  
Application No. 09/868,731  
Response to Office Action of December 28, 2005

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn and that the present application be permitted to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



---

David R. Morris, Reg. No. 53,348  
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS LLP  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698  
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)  
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)  
Customer No.: 08968

Date: March 15, 2006



Before Application of: Francois-Arnaud Remael  
Application No. 09/868,731  
Response to Office Action of December 28, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF DECEMBER 28, 2005 (along with any documents referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: March 15, 2006

  
Irina L. Mikitiouk

CH02/ 22442000.1